

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, as currently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 are presently pending in this application, Claim 1 having been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action of September 26, 2007, Claims 1-6 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi (U.S. Patent 3,991,254) in view of Iseli et al. (U.S. Patent 4,503,128) and Clough et al. (U.S. Patent 5,326,633), and further in view of Lange et el. (U.S. Patent 4,166,147); and alternatively, Claims 1-6 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi in view of Iseli et al. and Clough et al., and further in view of Lange et el. as evidenced by JP 06-239656 (hereinafter “JP ‘656”).

Claim 1 has been amended herein. This amendment is believed to find clear support in the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed, and no new matter is believed to be added thereby. If, however, the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work in a joint effort to derive mutually agreeable claim language.

Before addressing rejection based on the cited references, a brief review of Claim 1 as currently amended is believed to be helpful. Claim 1 is directed to a filter for the purification of an exhaust gas and recites, *inter alia*: “a porous ceramic carrier ...; and a catalyst coat layer provided in the partition wall portion of the porous ceramic carrier [*i.e.*, in a partition wall portion partitioning a plurality of through-holes extending in a longitudinal direction of the porous ceramic carrier] and comprising at least one oxide ceramic and a catalyst active component, the catalyst coat layer further comprising a first substance having a thermal conductivity higher than the oxide ceramic, a second substance having a refractive index

larger than a refractive index of the oxide ceramic, or a colored pigment, wherein the porous ceramic carrier has a porosity of 40-80% and a thermal conductivity of a filter body comprising the porous ceramic carrier and the catalyst coat layer is set to be 0.3-60 W/mk.”

It is respectfully submitted that none of Takeuchi, Iseli et al., Clough et al., Lange et al. and JP ‘656 teaches or suggests “a catalyst coat layer provided in the partition wall portion of the porous ceramic carrier [*i.e.*, in a partition wall portion partitioning a plurality of through-holes extending in a longitudinal direction of the porous ceramic carrier] and comprising at least one oxide ceramic and a catalyst active component, the catalyst coat layer further comprising a first substance having a thermal conductivity higher than the oxide ceramic, a second substance having a refractive index larger than a refractive index of the oxide ceramic, or a colored pigment, wherein the porous ceramic carrier has a porosity of 40-80% and a thermal conductivity of a filter body comprising the porous ceramic carrier and the catalyst coat layer is set to be 0.3-60 W/mk.” That is, Takeuchi is directed to an *insulating structure*, and describes an insulating layer (c) disposed in a space formed between the inner wall and outer wall of a double structure such as one formed by an outer container encasing a catalyst device. Iseli et al. and Clough et al. being directed to a thermally sprayable ceramic and a coated substrate, Iseli et al. simply describes a method in which a cordierite is thermally sprayed by flame or plasma onto certain components to withstand mechanical, thermal and abrasive conditions and Clough et al. merely describes coating a substrate such as SiC and cordierite with tin oxide. Moreover, according to Iseli et al., the coating provides a porosity of only up to 40 volume %, which is believed to be still too low for a filter. Finally, Lange et al. is directed to a shaped and fired TiO₂ article and cited to show “a titania sol with iron oxide as a pigment.” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter recited in amended Claim 1 is clearly distinguishable over Takeuchi, Iseli et al., Clough et al., Lange et al. and JP ‘656, and because Takeuchi, Iseli et al., Clough et al.,

Lange et al. and JP '656 fail to disclose the catalyst layer as recited in amended Claim 1, their teachings even in combination are not believed to render the filter recited in Claim 1 obvious.

Since Claims 2-6 and 8-12 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, substantially the same arguments set forth above also apply to these dependent claims. Hence, Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are believed to be allowable as well.

In view of the amendment and discussions presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early action favorable to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Akihiro Yamazaki
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 46,155

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Edwin D. Garlepp
Registration No. 45,330

AY/mda

I:\ATTY\AKY\25S\259205\259205US_AME 3.DOC